



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/759,932

01/16/2004

Vijaylaxmi Chakravarty

AUS920030846US1

8214

45502 7590 12/08/2008

DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY.,  
SUITE 2110  
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

HEFFINGTON, JOHN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2179

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/08/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/759,932	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHAKRAVARTY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JOHN M. HEFFINGTON	<b>Art Unit</b> 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 8-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to the amended filing of 11 September 2008. Claims 1, 2, 8 and 13-15 have been amended. Claims 1-5 and 8-20 are pending and have been considered below.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8 and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2179

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (US 5,892,948).

Claims 1 and 15: Aoki discloses a method and computer program product for applying multiple operations for execution on a single file displayed on a graphical user interface, comprising:

- a. associating a different operation with each of a plurality of inputs (column 9, lines 47-67, column 10, lines 1-4, figures 6A-6E);
- b. selecting a first input to apply a first operation to be executed on the single file (column 17, lines 25-29);
- c. selecting a file display for the single file on a graphical user interface (GUI) to associate the selected first input with the single file (column 8, lines 41-44);
- d. selecting a second input to apply a second operation to be executed on the single file (column 17, lines 25-29);
- e. presenting a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation (figures 6A-6E);
- f. presenting a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation such that the first distinct visual feature is also being presented (figures 6A-6E),

Art Unit: 2179

but does not disclose

- a. associating a distinct visual display feature with each of the different operations;
- b. presenting a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation in a first portion of the file display of the single file;
- c. reselecting the file display for the single file to associate the selected second input with the single file;
- d. presenting a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation in a second portion of the reselected file display of the single file such that the first distinct visual feature is also being presented.

However, Aoki discloses associating a distinct visual feature with an executing and non-executing function (figures 6A-6E) and associating a distinct visual feature with a branch function (figure 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add associating a distinct visual display feature with each of the different operations to Aoki. One could have been motivated to add associating a distinct visual display feature with each of the different operations to Aoki because it would be beneficial to a user to be able to distinguish visually the various function that are composed together to form a composite function.

Aoki discloses that an operation by the user in the window is detected as an event by the window management system and supplied to the operational environment control portion. The operational environment control portion sends an execution instruction

Art Unit: 2179

based on the event to a process management portion and an interpreter. When receiving an event corresponding to the execution of a single normal function or to a data display request, the process management portion drives the file system to generate a process and executes the function (column 17, lines 8-18). Further, Aoki discloses that each function icon may be moved to a desired location (column 17, line 28). In an embodiment, Aoki discloses that an icon and a program, which are to be processed, are specified; specifically, an icon to be processed is dragged to and dropped in an icon (icon series) (column 17, lines 45-48). Further, Aoki discloses that when an icon is double clicked, the function corresponding to the icon is allowed to start (column 17, lines 29-35). Aoki further discloses that combined function icons can be successively executed (column 5, lines 36-37). Furthermore, Aoki indicates that when a data file icon is dragged to a function icon, that the data file icon is subsumed in the function icon (figures 2A – 2C). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add

- a. presenting a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation in a first portion of the file display of the single file;
- b. reselecting the file display for the single file to associate the selected second input with the single file;
- c. presenting a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation in a second portion of the reselected file display of the single file such that the first distinct visual feature is also being presented,

to Aoki. One could have been motivated to add

- a. presenting a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation in a first portion of the file display of the single file;
- b. reselecting the file display for the single file to associate the selected second input with the single file;
- c. presenting a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation in a second portion of the reselected file display of the single file such that the first distinct visual feature is also being presented,

to Aoki because the examiner believes that it is within the scope of Aoki that other events or operations detected in the window may be used to initiate an operation or a function on a file, specifically, since function icons may be moved, a function icon may be dragged and dropped onto a file icon, or icon to be processed. Since the file icon appears to be subsumed by the function icon and since a function may be initiated by double clicking the function icon, i.e. the function does not have to be executed on the file immediately, it would have been obvious to alter the function icon to indicate that a data file has been associated with the function icon. Therefore, if the function icon is dragged to the file icon, then the file icon will be replaced, i.e. altered to indicate that a function has been associated with the file icon. Now, since the function may be executed only when it is double clicked, other functions may be appended to the original

Art Unit: 2179

function icon as disclosed in Aoki, thereby further altering the icon that replaced the original file icon.

Claim 8: Aoki discloses a computer system for applying multiple operations for executing on a single file displayed on a graphical user interface, the system comprising:

- a. a monitor for displaying a file display for a single file in a graphical user interface (GUI) (column 8, lines 41-55, figures 6A-6E);
- b. a plurality of inputs, each input being associated with a different operation to be applied the file display for the single file (column 9, lines 47-67, column 10, lines 1-4, figures 6A-6E), and
- c. an input device for selecting the file display for the single file in the GUI in a first instance after engaging a first input,
- d. engaging a second input from the plurality of inputs, wherein
- e. a first operation to be applied for execution on the single file is associated with the first input and a second operation to be applied for execution on the single file is associated with the second input (column 8, lines 41-55, figures 6A-6E),

but does not disclose:

- a. each different operation being associated with a distinct visual display applied to a displayed file;
- b. reselecting the file display for the single file in a second subsequent instance,



Art Unit: 2179

- c. a first portion of the file display of the single file presents a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation, and wherein a second portion of the file display of the single file presents a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation.

However, Aoki discloses associating a distinct visual feature with an executing and non-executing function (figures 6A-6E) and associating a distinct visual feature with a branch function (figure 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add associating a distinct visual display feature with each of the different operations to Aoki. One could have been motivated to add associating a distinct visual display feature with each of the different operations to Aoki because it would be beneficial to a user to be able to distinguish visually the various function that are composed together to form a composite function.

Aoki discloses that an operation by the user in the window is detected as an event by the window management system and supplied to the operational environment control portion. The operational environment control portion sends an execution instruction based on the event to a process management portion and an interpreter. When receiving an event corresponding to the execution of a single normal function or to a data display request, the process management portion drives the file system to generate a process and executes the function (column 17, lines 8-18). Further, Aoki discloses that each function icon may be moved to a desired location (column 17, line

Art Unit: 2179

28). In an embodiment, Aoki discloses that an icon and a program, which are to be processed, are specified; specifically, an icon to be processed is dragged to and dropped in an icon (icon series) (column 17, lines 45-48). Further, Aoki discloses that when an icon is double clicked, the function corresponding to the icon is allowed to start (column 17, lines 29-35). Aoki further discloses that combined function icons can be successively executed (column 5, lines 36-37). Furthermore, Aoki indicates that when a data file icon is dragged to a function icon, that the data file icon is subsumed in the function icon (figures 2A – 2C). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add

- a. each different operation being associated with a distinct visual display applied to a displayed file;
- b. reselecting the file display for the single file in a second subsequent instance,
- c. a first portion of the file display of the single file presents a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation, and wherein a second portion of the file display of the single file presents a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation,

to Aoki. One could have been motivated to add

- a. each different operation being associated with a distinct visual display applied to a displayed file;
- b. reselecting the file display for the single file in a second subsequent instance,

Art Unit: 2179

- c. a first portion of the file display of the single file presents a first distinct visual feature associated with the first operation, and wherein a second portion of the file display of the single file presents a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation,

to Aoki because the examiner believes that it is within the scope of Aoki that other events or operations detected in the window may be used to initiate an operation or a function on a file, specifically, since function icons may be moved, a function icon may be dragged and dropped onto a file icon, or icon to be processed. Since the file icon appears to be subsumed by the function icon and since a function may be initiated by double clicking the function icon, i.e. the function does not have to be executed on the file immediately, it would have been obvious to alter the function icon to indicate that a data file has been associated with the function icon. Therefore, if the function icon is dragged to the file icon, then the file icon will be replaced, i.e. altered to indicate that a function has been associated with the file icon. Now, since the function may be executed only when it is double clicked, other functions may be appended to the original function icon as disclosed in Aoki, thereby further altering the icon that replaced the original file icon.

Claim 2: Aoki discloses the method of claim 1 and Aoki further discloses subsequently executing the first and second operations on the single file, after the first and second distinct visual features are respectfully displayed on the first and second portions of the

Art Unit: 2179

file display and the first and second operations are confirmed for execution on the single file (column 5, lines 36-37, column 17, lines 8-18, lines 29-35).

Claims 3, 10 and 17: Aoki discloses the method, system and computer program product of claims 1, 8 and 15 and but does not disclose the distinct visual features are color-coded. However, Aiko discloses shading a function as a distinct visual feature (figure 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the distinct visual features are color-coded to Aiko and listio. One could have been motivated to add the distinct visual features are color-coded to Aiko and listio because the shading in Aiko could represent color and color is readily recognizable by a user as distinguishing one icon from another.

Claims 4, 11 and 18: Aoki discloses the method, system and computer program product of claims 1, 8 and 15 and Aiko further discloses the distinct visual features are geometric patterns (figures 6A-6E).

Claims 5, 12 and 20: Aoki discloses the method, system and computer program product of claims 1, 8 and 15, and Aiko further discloses the plurality of inputs are selected icons on the GUI (column 9, lines 47-67, column 10, lines 1-4, figures 6A-6E).

Claims 9 and 16: Aoki discloses the computer system and computer program product of claims 8 and 15, and Aiko further discloses an execution unit for executing the first and

Art Unit: 2179

second operations on the single file according to a pre-determined execution order for the first and second operations (column 2, lines 52-59).

5. Claims 13, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. (US 5,892,948) in view of Talbert (US 2004/0114265 A1).

Claims 13 and 19: Aoki discloses the computer system and computer program product of claims 8 and 15, but does not disclose the single file is sensitive file selected for deletion. However, Talbert discloses overwriting with a pattern of 1's and 0's a file when a job involving the file is finished (paragraphs 0004, and 0005). It is common in the art to render un-readable files that are sensitive, for example, shredding a document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the first and second files are both sensitive files selected for deletion to Aoki. One could have been motivated to add the first and second files are both sensitive files selected for deletion to Aoki because it is a common practice to delete sensitive files after the need to view the files has passed.

Claim 14: Aiko and Talbert disclose The computer system of claim 13 and Talbert discloses overwriting with a pattern of 1's and 0's a file when a job involving the file is finished and the sensitive files are erased from a hard disk on a computer by re-formatting only areas on the hard disk that had stored the sensitive files (paragraphs 0004, 0005). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2179

art at the time of the invention to add the sensitive file are erased from a hard disk on a computer by re-formatting only areas on the hard disk that had stored the sensitive file via multiple overwrites of these disk areas using opposing bit patterns to Aiko and Talbert. One could have been motivated to add the sensitive file are erased from a hard disk on a computer by re-formatting only areas on the hard disk that had stored the sensitive file via multiple overwrites of these disk areas using opposing bit patterns to Aiko and Talbert because, normally, when a file is deleted from a hard disk, only the pointers to the file are deleted and overwriting the file with a pattern of 1's and 0's actually deletes the contents of the file. It provides a greater guarantee that a sensitive file is unreadable if a pattern of 1's and 0's is used to overwrite the file.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2179

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Heffington whose telephone number is (571) 270-1696. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 - 5:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMH

12/3/08

/Ba Huynh/

Application/Control Number: 10/759,932

Page 15

Art Unit: 2179

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179